

STATOTHR

instruction of this type which would only be applicable to the DDO. If the case is that [ ] is deficient, then I feel we should broaden the overall Agency policy to satisfy the deficiency through a joint study group, whose purpose would be to thoroughly and objectively review our [ ]

STATINTL

STATOTHR

/ / Michael J. Malanick

Michael J. Malanick

CONCURRENCE:

STATINTL

[ ]  
Robert W. Gambino  
Director of Security

2 AUG 1976  
Date

(Signed) F. W. M. Janney

F.W.M. Janney  
Director of Personnel

3 AUG 1976  
Date

Distribution:

Original & 1 - Addressee  
1 - D/Personnel  
1 - D/Security  
2 - DDA Chrono. Subject

ORIGINATOR

[ ]  
Robert W. Gambino  
Director of Security

2 AUG 1976  
Date

STATINTL

# ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

Proposed

STATINTL

FROM:

EXTENSION

NO.

DATE

Michael J. Malanick

A/Deputy Director for Administration

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

1.  
D/Personnel  
5E-58 Headquarters

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

DDA REGISTRY

Personnel

SENDER WILL CHECK CLASSIFICATION TOP AND BOTTOM					
UNCLASSIFIED		CONFIDENTIAL		SECRET	
<b>OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP</b>					
TO	NAME AND ADDRESS	DATE	INITIALS		
1	<i>Bob Gable</i>				
2	Director of Security Room 4E-60				
3					
4					
5					
6					
ACTION		DIRECT REPLY		PREPARE REPLY	
APPROVAL		DISPATCH		RECOMMENDATION	
COMMENT		FILE		RETURN	
CONCURRENCE		INFORMATION		SIGNATURE	
Att: DDA 76-4219					
Remarks:					
<p><i>Here is the paper &amp; material to you at the place. If you understand it, please explain it to me.</i></p>					
<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 200px; height: 40px; margin: 10px auto;"></div>					
FOLD HERE					
FROM: NAME, ADDRESS				DATE	
DD/Administration 7D-24 5454				8/25/76	
UNCLASSIFIED		CONFIDENTIAL		SECRET	

FORM NO. 1-67 237 Use previous editions

(40)

DDA Remarks: "Here is the paper I mentioned to you on the phone. If you understand it, please explain it to me. /s/Jack Blake"

Distribution: Orig RS - D/OS w/Ref DDA 76-3896 (Memo to DDO fr ADDA, dtd 4 August 1976) & Att DDA 76-4219

1 RS - DDA Subject w/att (Pink RS to DDA fr DDO, dtd 20 August; Same Subject

1 RS - JFB Chrono w/o atts

DDA:JFBlake:der (25 August 1976)

25X1A

Subject: 

STATINTL

SENDER WILL CHECK CLASSIFICATION TOP AND BOTTOM			
UNCLASSIFIED		Approved For Release 2002/05/01 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000600100007-2	SECRET
OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP			
TO	NAME AND ADDRESS	DATE	INITIALS
1	ADD/A	23 AUG 1976	h
2	DDA		
3			
4			
5			
6			
ACTION		DIRECT REPLY	PREPARE REPLY
APPROVAL		DISPATCH	RECOMMENDATION
COMMENT		FILE	RETURN
CONCURRENCE		INFORMATION	SIGNATURE

Remarks:

I'm not sure I grab the reference to the Privacy Act in the attached comments. I see nothing in Mike's comments which runs afoul of the Privacy Act.

FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER

PHONE NO.		DATE
		8/23
CONFIDENTIAL	SECRET	

FORM NO. 237 Use previous editions  
1-67

(40)

25X1A

25X1A

☐ UNCLASSIFIED☐ INTERNAL  
USE ONLY☐ CONFIDENTIAL☐ SECRET

Approved For Release 2002/05/01 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000600100007-2

SUBJECT: (Optional)

FROM:

DDO

EXTENSION

1414

NO.

DATE 20 August 1976

DDA Registry

76-4219

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S  
INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1. A-EO/ DDA

8/23

B

Re Mike Malanick's memo of 4 August, which has taken a bit of time to get to me, on the

STATOTHR

2.

8/23

M

STATOTHR

A DDA

3.

8/25/76

7

As I see it, the ball is in your court now. We came up with a proposal along the lines that I discussed with you and Bob Gambino several months ago and, obviously, you folks don't like it. I agree with you both that we need to get after this matter, but, before you can change the current regulation, we need a counter-proposal from you all. Frankly, I worry about Mike's second paragraph, since it strikes me that such a position

DDA

4.

5.

cc: C/PS/CMG  
ADDO  
EA/DDO  
DDO/REG

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

STATOTHR

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

(OVER)

Approved For Release 2002/05/01 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000600100007-2

out of date on this point, and, before, we wind up in acrimony with Senators like Hart and Bayh, I believe we should straighten up the [ ] to a point where we can defend it on grounds of national security.

STATOTHR

But then these are only my thoughts. In any case, I send this note in the hope of moving this subject quickly to the next psychological couch.

UNCLASSIFIED		CONFIDENTIAL		SECRET	
OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP					
TO	NAME AND ADDRESS		DATE	INITIALS	
1	Chief, Review Staff			B	
2					
3	Trunk		8/17	JSM	
4					
5	Mary				
6	file Marrage to Kilmer				
ACTION		DIRECT REPLY	PREPARE REPLY		
APPROVAL		DISPATCH	RECOMMENDATION		
COMMENT		FILE	RETURN		
CONCURRENCE		INFORMATION	SIGNATURE		
Remarks:					
<p>OS wrote this - DCA audit sent copy to OF for comment. (We had a draft from Joe Drury to Ben.) - and then diagnosed this through because bombing was going away. Ben was in the area, with an overseas release. Had the criticism of the [redacted] is misleading - the</p>					
FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER					
FROM: NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO.					DATE
<p>AP [redacted]</p>					8/17/76
<p>Approved For Release 2002/05/01 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000600100</p>					
UNCLASSIFIED		CONFIDENTIAL		SECRET	



Reg. is as has — ~~as the day~~

I told Ben it was generally  
OK but the ~~first~~ <sup>second</sup> para is  
pretty not correct —

However !